



INVESTIGATION AND COMPARISON OF IRRATIONAL BELIEFS AND EMOTIONAL SELF-EFFICACY OF DRIVERS WITH HIGH-RISK BEHAVIORS AND ORDINARY DRIVERS IN TEHRAN

Hamid Beheshti¹ | Ahmad Sour²

¹ M.A in psychology, Islamic Azad university, Malard, Tehran, Iran.

² Associate professor, Department of psychology, Police university, Tehran, Iran.

ABSTRACT

The present study was a causal-comparative study with the aim of determining the difference between irrational beliefs and emotional self-efficacy of drivers with risky behaviors and ordinary drivers in Tehran. The statistical population of this study was all internally taxi drivers driving in district 12 of Tehran municipality in 2017. Among them, 200 drivers were selected using random cluster sampling method and responded questionnaires of irrational beliefs, Manchester driving habits and emotional self-efficacy. Data analysis was performed using descriptive statistics (frequency, central indexes and dispersion) and inferential statistics (analysis of variance). The results showed significant differences between irrational beliefs and emotional self-efficacy of drivers with risky behaviors and ordinary drivers in Tehran ($P < 0.01$). It was concluded that the amount of irrational beliefs factors in drivers with high-risk behaviors were more than those of normal drivers and the amount of emotional self-efficacy factors in drivers with high-risk behaviors were less than those of normal drivers. The results of this study showed that irrational beliefs, more and emotional self-efficacy, less, are one of the factors influencing of driving risk behaviors outbreak.

KEYWORDS: Irrational beliefs, emotional self-efficacy, high-risk driving.

INTRODUCTION:

As the increased use of personal vehicles and comfort brought to civilized people, we have seen great difficulties in increasing the number of high-risk accidents and driving as a social problem. Driving is a complex behavior that consists of three components of cognitive, emotional and sensory-movement, and refers to the risky driving behavior of committing two or more opposing acts that compromise individuals or other means, so that in most cases defensive reactions Causes another driver (eizi, 2015). Risky driving according to Jessor (1968), who proposed the Problem Behavior Theory, part of the complex personality system (values, feelings and beliefs), the perceived perceptual system (common behaviors in peer groups, school, family), and the behavioral system So that the combination of these three appears in high-risk behaviors (Jessor et al., 2017). On the other hand, based on the Theory of Planned Behavior proposed by Ajzen (1991), there is a certain amount of planning for each behavior, and these behaviors are predictable intent. According to this model, three Attitude-toward-the Act, Subjective Norms (such as people's attitudes toward a subject) and perceptual perceptions (perceived behavioral control) or self-efficacy are influential on formation of intention (Ajzen, 2015). The attitude toward behavior refers to how much the intended behavior is to a desirable, pleasant, useful or enjoyable person; this depends on the individual's judgment of the effects and consequences of the behavior. In terms of abstract norms, the amount of social pressure impacted by a person to conduct and, in other words, reflects the social influence and influence on the individual. Perceived behavioral control is a measure of the individual's feelings about how much he or she behaves under his voluntary control. Perceived behavioral control, either directly or indirectly, through intent, may affect behavior (Ashough et al., 2013). The study of Carey & Sarma (2016), also showed that when high perceived efficiencies are combined with threatening messages, they are rapidly reducing, and threat-based road safety announcements target emotional (fear) and cognitive (perceived efficiency) mechanisms. Can have a positive impact on driving behaviors. So, as you can see, factors such as belief, attitude and self-efficacy contribute to the formation of risky driving behavior.

Self-efficacy refers to people's belief in their ability to perform well and successfully to produce the desired outcomes and achievements (Paciello et al., 2016). Self-efficacy is an important aspect of performance in a variety of domains, and for emotional functioning it is the basis of emotional competence and satisfactory emotional performance leads to better mood and positive mood formation (Gabriel et al., 2016). Emotional self-efficacy means a person's perception of his ability to control and manage emotions and negative thoughts (Muris, 2001). Individuals with high emotional self-efficacy are more responsive to dealing with negative emotions (Valois et al., 2008).

Research has shown that the pleasure and excitement of high-risk behaviors are among the factors affecting the incidence of high-risk drivers (Tahmasebi et al., 2014; Goodarzi and Shirazi, 2005). For example, state excitement, such as anger, has a negative effect on the effectiveness of road-based road safety messages (Carey & Sarma, 2016), and drivers with anxious excitement in self-provoking situations are more confident and aggressive driving behavior is self-evident. (Blankenship et al., 2013). On the other hand, rumination of anger has a mediator role in the relationship between driving anger and the history of aggressive driv-

ing behaviors (Suhr & Nesbit, 2013). Anger, like any other excitement, requires the regulation and management of excitement. According to the results of the study, Seoof Haddadi Sani et al. (1393) showed that the ability to self-regulate and exert an inhibition in the development of risky driving behaviors. Risky driving behavior also correlates with self-efficacy, so that unsafe driving has a significant correlation with self-efficacy, efficiency of response, severity, reward and perceived cost, as well as unsafe driving intention (Morovati Sharifabad et al., 2011).

On the other hand, the study of psychological factors associated with high-risk driving behaviors, including irrational attitudes and beliefs, is another step in solving the problem of this social harm. Belief means accepting an origin, a religion, or a truth (Etkinson, 2016). Ellis considers illnesses and mental disorders as a result of misconceptions, misconceptions and beliefs, and wrong attitudes (Pourmohammadrezae Tajrishi et al., 2014). From Ellis's perspective, beliefs are divided into logical and irrational divisions. Logical beliefs are effective beliefs that help one to achieve his important, realistic, logical and flexible goals. In contrast, irrational beliefs of beliefs that are not truthful and consistent with reality eliminate the balance of the individual and prevent successful encounters with provocative events (Siavoshi et al., 2011). According to Hashemi's (1392) study, the perception of traffic jams and attitudes towards driving rules in beginner drivers is less than those experienced drivers. Also, the study of Nesbit & Conger (2012) showed that drivers with more aggressive behaviors show a different pattern of emotional experiences, irrationally problematic cognitions and beliefs than those who show less aggressiveness.

The study of the psychological causes of high-risk driving is therefore important, which is the first step in solving the problem and the problem of this social harm. On the other hand, the study of irrational beliefs as the most important cognitive cause of human behavior, especially in high-risk driving behavior, is necessary. Understanding these beliefs and trying to improve them can replace healthy driving behavior, and this leads to the management and control of optimum behavior and excitement during driving and emotional self-efficacy. Therefore, considering the position of emotional self-efficacy in mental health and its sustainable effects on increasing social adjustment, and considering that individuals with low emotional self-efficacy have more adaptive and behavioral problems than their counterparts, this study intends to determine the difference between irrational beliefs And emotional self-efficacy of drivers with high-risk behaviors and ordinary drivers in Tehran.

METHOD:

This is a causal-comparative study and the statistical population consists of all city taxi drivers operating in the 12th district of Tehran in 2017. 200 samples were selected using randomized cluster sampling. The criteria for entering the study were: having at least 19 years of age and driving regularly from one year before the time of study and exit criteria, unwillingness to participate in the study and not responding to more than 10% of distributed questionnaires. In order to observe ethical considerations in the implementation of the study, completion of the questionnaires was carried out unaware and coded and the confidentiality of the responses of the subjects was observed. Data collection was done using the following scales:

The Irrational Beliefs Test: The Irrational Beliefs Test (Jones, 1968) was constructed based on Ellis's theory and evaluated for inefficient thoughts, and included 100 subtle scales of 10 subclasses prepared by a five-course Likert method. The subscales of the test are: Demand for Approval (DA), High Self Expectation (HSE), Blame Proneness (BP), Frustration Reaction (FR), Emotionality Irresponsibility (EI), Anxious Over concern (AO), Problem Avoidance (PA), Dependency (D), Helplessness for Change (HC), and Perfectionism (P) (Hojjat et al., 1392). The validity of the test was evaluated using two methods of face validity and convergent validity, and the correlation coefficient of the test with Beck Depression Inventory was 0.82 (quoted by Hojjat et al., 2013). Amin Saremi et al. (2015) also have a validity and reliability of 0.71 and 0.74 respectively.

Manchester Driving Behavior Questionnaire (MDBQ): The Manchester Driving Behavior Questionnaire (Rissen et al., 1990) contains 26 questions that are rated 0-5 in a Likert range. The questions differ in two aspects: one in terms of behavior and the other in the degree of risk that that behavior has for other drivers. Abnormal behaviors include four categories: inaccurate errors, mistakes, intentional violations, and unpardoned violations. Also, there are three categories of risk for these behaviors: a) non-hazardous behaviors for other road drivers and only to create a feeling of restlessness for others (low risk), b) behaviors that are likely to endanger others (Moderate risk); and (c) other drivers are likely to be at risk (high risk) (Arizi Samani & Haghayeq, 2009). The main score for each group is obtained by taking the average score of options in each section.

The research done on reliability and validity of this questionnaire shows its reliability and desirability in research. In the research of Shakerinia and

Mohammadpour (2010), the reliability of this questionnaire was obtained through Cronbach's alpha of 0.96. The validity of this questionnaire was obtained from the Goodarzi and Shirazi studies (2005) by content validity and according to the experts' opinion. The relevance of the data to hazardous driving behavior was 0.98 and about the relevance of the subcategories to the three categories of landslides, Errors and violations, the coefficient of agreement was 0.95, 0.92 and 0.96.

Emotional Self Efficacy Scale (ESES): The Emotional Self-efficacy Scale (Beverley et al., 2008) is based on the four-dimensional model of Salovi and Mayer Emotional Intelligence (1997). This scale is used in research areas of emotional intelligence and self-efficacy. The questions are based on the five-letter Likert scale from grade 1 (totally disagree) to score 5 (I totally agree). The components of the emotional self-efficacy scale are: the evaluation of emotions in oneself and others, the expression of excitement, the regulation of emotions in oneself and others, and the use of excitement in problem solving. The reliability of the test questions has been reported based on Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.96. The validity of emotional self-efficacy scale has been reported through adequate correlation analysis. This scale was initially translated by the scholars and then by the three specialist English translators, and finally the Persian version was prepared and prepared (quoted by Khodayari Fard et al., 2012).

FINDINGS:

In this study, 200 motorhome taxi drivers were surveyed, of which 78 were high risk drivers and 122 were normal drivers. The highest frequency of respondents belonged to men; most respondents were between the ages of 36 and 40 and had diploma education. Also, most drivers once had an accident in the past year.

Table 1: Statistical characteristics of the factors of the dependent variables of irrational beliefs and emotional self-efficacy

Normal Drivers		Drivers with high-risk behaviors		Factors
The standard deviation	Average	The standard deviation	Average	
7/65	34/88	10/41	44/05	Demand for Approval (DA)
6/67	29/73	6/50	35/24	High Self Expectation (HSE)
6/80	32	5/85	24/57	Blame Proneness (BP)
5/36	28/51	04/02	32/48	Frustration Reaction (FR)
7/007	31/28	4/96	35/66	Emotionality Irresponsibility (EI)
5/77	29/36	55/5	32/49	Anxious Over concern (AO)
6/39	29/38	5/46	35/53	Problem Avoidance (PA)
5/53	28/80	4/22	32/84	Dependency (D)
6/31	30/82	5/49	35/61	Helplessness for Change (HC)
5/53	29/97	5/55	34/36	Perfectionism (P)
7/43	34/87	7/21	29/84	Evaluating the excitement in him/herself and others
3/62	24/05	3/14	26/12	Showing the Excitement
7/008	30/13	4/36	25/81	Set the excitement in yourself and others
2/36	11/21	2/49	9/42	Use the excitements to solve the problem

Table 1 data shows that there is a difference between the average group of drivers with high risk behaviors and average drivers in the dependent variables of irrational beliefs and emotional self-efficacy. The results show that the average variables of the need for confirmation and support from others, excessive expectation, tendency to blame, reaction to failure, emotional insecurity, excessive concern with anxiety about the future, avoidance of problems, dependence, helplessness towards change, perfectionism, The excitement in the group of high-risk drivers is greater than that of ordinary drivers, and the amount of emotion assessment in themselves and others, the regulation of excitement in themselves and others, is the use of excitement in solving the problem in ordinary drivers more than ordinary drivers.

Table 2: Multivariate variance of F ratio for the combined variable size of irrational beliefs and emotional self-efficacy

Eta	Significance level	(14.185)F	Value	Source
0/581	0/000	18/298	0/491	Combined variable (group)

The values of the Eta squares shown in Table 2 are the contribution of the variance associated with the new compound variable. The general rule is that if this is a value of 0.14, the effect of risky drivers and ordinary drivers on the variables of irrational beliefs and emotional self-efficacy. In Table 2, this value is for a new compound variable called the group 0/581, which indicates a high effect. Also, the results of the Wilkes Lambda test on the combined variable are significant. The significance of the results of variance analysis for dependent variables of irrational beliefs and emotional self-efficacy is presented in Table 3. Significantly, the new combination variable indicates that the participants in the two groups are

different and the mean of the groups is influenced by the independent variable.

$$F_{(14,185)} = 298/18 \quad P < 01/0 \quad \text{Lambda} = 491/0 \quad \text{Partial } \eta^2 = 581/0$$

Table 3: Multivariate analysis of variance for comparison of the mean of irrational beliefs and emotional self-efficacy

Effect size	Significance level P	Freedom Degree of Error	Freedom Degree	F	Value	Test name
0/581	0/000	185	14	18/298	0/581	Piley effect
0/581	0/000	185	14	18/298	0/491	Wilks Lambda
0/581	0/000	185	14	18/298	1/385	Hatling effect
0/581	0/000	185	14	18/298	1/385	The biggest root on

According to Table 3 data, the mean scores of irrational beliefs and emotional self-efficacy of two groups of risky drivers and normal drivers in one of the variables of irrational beliefs and emotional self-efficacy are significantly different. For more accurate analysis, the results of variance analysis in the differences between the two groups of high risk drivers and normal drivers in each of the variables of irrational beliefs and emotional self-efficacy are presented in Table 4.

Table 4: Results of one-variable variance analysis for variables of irrational beliefs and emotional self-efficacy

Test power	Effect size	Significance level P	F	Average squares	Freedom Degree	Sum of squares	Source of diffraction
				MS	df	SS	
1/100	0/207	0/000	51/566	4081/23	1	4081/023	Demand for Approval (DA)
				79/142	198	15670/132	Error
1/100	0/146	0/000	33/882	1476/526	1	1476/526	High Self Expectation (HSE)
				42/052	198	8628/429	Error
1/100	0/157	0/000	7/604	319/769	1	319/769	Blame Proneness (BP)
				42/052	198	8326/386	Error
1/100	0/141	0/000	32/529	764/926	1	764/926	Frustration Reaction (FR)
				23/515	198	4655/954	Error
1/100	0/168	0/000	23/928	931/753	1	931/753	Emotionality Irresponsibility (EI)
				38/941	198	7710/247	Error
1/100	0/169	0/000	14/793	477/210	1	477/210	Anxious Over concern (AO)
				23/281	198	6391/670	Error
1/100	0/204	0/000	50/752	1838/892	1	1838/892	Problem Avoidance (PA)
				36/233	198	1774/128	Error
1/100	0/166	0/000	31/298	792/478	1	792/478	Dependency (D)
				25/320	198	5013/442	Error
1/100	0/156	0/000	31/277	1115/887	1	1115/887	Helplessness for Change (HC)
				35/792	198	7086/893	Error
1/100	0/167	0/000	35/687	934/515	1	934/515	Perfectionism (P)
				35/687	198	7066/080	Error
1/100	0/641	0/000	139/498	1227/714	1	1227/714	Evaluating the excitement in him/herself and others
				137/335	198	10712/150	Error
1/100	0/182	0/000	17/678	207/893	1	207/893	Showing the Excitement
				11/760	198	2328/478	Error
1/100	0/151	0/000	24/738	906/562	1	906/562	Set the excitement in yourself and others
				36/646	198	7255/993	Error
1/100	0/118	0/000	26/376	154/437	1	154/437	Use the excitements to solve the problem
				5/855	198	1159/318	Error

Table 4 shows the results of ANOVA single-variable analysis of variance. Regarding the fact that there are fourteen dependent variables, by dividing 0.01 on 14 Bonferroni corrections, then the threshold is significantly smaller than 0/007, this is true for all fourteen variables. The Eta value indicates that approximately 20.7% of the variance of the variable is necessary to confirm the support of others and 14.6% of their excessive variance, and 15.7% of the tendency to blame, and 14.1% of the response to the blame, and 14.1% Variance of failure response, and 16.8% of emotional insensitivity variance, and 16.9% of worries more than worry about anxiety about the future, and 20.4% of the problem-avoidance variances, and 16.6% of dependency variance, and 15.6% of the variance of helplessness Versus change, and 16.7% of perfectionism variance, and 15.3% of the variance in the assessment of emotions in themselves and others, and 18.2% of the excitement variances, and 1 / 15% of the variance of emotion setting in themselves and others, and 18.7% of the variance of the use of excitement in solving the problem for the group variable. Tables 2 and 4 show that there is a significant difference between the group of drivers with risky behaviors and normal drivers in terms of the components of irrational beliefs and emotional self-efficacy.

$$F_{(14,185)} = 298/18; P < 01/0; \text{Lambda} = 491/0; \text{Partial } \eta^2 = 581/0$$

This difference is due to the comparison of the meanings in the variables of the need for confirmation and support from others, excessive expectation, tendency to blame, reaction to failure, emotional insecurity, excessive concern with anxiety about the future, avoidance of problems, dependence, helplessness towards change Perfectionism is the expression of excitement in the group of high-risk drivers more than ordinary drivers, and the amount of emotion assessment in themselves and others, the regulation of excitement in themselves and others, the use of excitement in solving the problem in ordinary drivers is more than high-risk drivers.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION:

The purpose of this study was to determine the difference between irrational beliefs and emotional self-efficacy of drivers with risky behaviors and ordinary drivers in Tehran. Results showed that there is a significant difference between irrational beliefs and emotional self-efficacy of drivers with high risk behaviors and ordinary drivers in Tehran. This finding is consistent with the results of

Nesbit & Conger (2012) research, which showed that drivers who have more aggressive behaviors than the less aggressive drivers show a different pattern of emotional experiences, problematic cognitive tendencies, and negative consequences after it. It can be said that drivers who do not have a proper understanding of their excitement, and, on the other hand, have irrational beliefs, such as being never mistaken in driving issues, driving in fluency, collision with others, wanting to retaliate someone else's driving behavior, or perfectionism along the way, in a shorter time, they do not risk driving behaviors.

The results of Tahmasebi et al. (1393) and Seoof Haddadi Sani et al. (2014) are in line with the findings of this study. Tahmasebi et al. (2014) in their research, the most important aspect in driving high-risk behaviors was pleasure and excitement. In fact, the adjustment and management of excitement makes drivers in situations that suffer from negative emotions to use appropriate coping strategies and thus more resistant to driving hazardous behaviors. Seoof Haddadi Sani et al. (2014) also concluded that there is a positive relationship between driving anger and emotional self-control with driving risk behaviors and most of the high-risk behaviors in driving were due to the feeling of excitement and the inability to regulate excitement. Risky driving can be a way to reduce unpleasant excitement such as helplessness, anxiety and anxiety caused by daily and personal problems of drivers, and because one does not have sufficient and adaptive strategies, he does not use harmful methods. Openness to experiences and excitement is associated with high-risk driving behavior, and the lack of self-regulation in excitement is exposing individuals to high-risk behaviors. This finding was in line with the results of Blankenship et al. (2013) and Carey & Sarma (2016), which endorsed the role of excitement, especially anger, in driving high-risk behavior.

On the other hand, Morovati Sharifabad and colleagues (2011) showed that insignificant driving has a significant correlation with self-efficacy, efficiency of response, severity, reward and perceived cost, as well as unsafe driving intention, which is confirmed by the present study. Self-efficacy makes people feel more competent and self-assured. Emotional self-efficacy means a person's perception of his ability to control and manage emotions and negative thoughts (Maurice, 2001). Individuals with high emotional self-efficacy respond more negatively to dealing with negative emotions (Valois et al., 2008) and are more responsive in social situations. However, research that directly addresses the relationship between emotional self-efficacy and high-risk behaviors has not been found, but

according to the results of the above-mentioned studies, drivers with higher emotional self-efficacy are less likely to be at risk in driving behavior.

In confirmation of the current study, Suhr & Nesbit (2013) also suggested that rumination, especially rumination, predicts the anger of aggressive driving behavior. The rumination of thought is caused by negative and irrational beliefs. A rumination is a set of passive thoughts that has a repetitive aspect that prevents the problem from being solved. Ruminants have many harmful consequences, including inhibition of effective behaviors and the tendency towards risky driving behavior. Shakerinia and Mohammadpour (2010) also showed that mental health can predict risky driving behavior, and those who have less irrational beliefs and more emotional self-efficacy are psychologically more healthy.

People's attitudes are largely driven by their intentions and attitudes. Behavioral intentions are the product of not only attitudes but also social influences and self-efficacy. The relationship between the intentions and the behavior depends on whether the person has the skills to carry out this behavior. It seems that attitudes are influenced by cognitive processes and more than anything else it's consequential expectations because beliefs affect behavior and lead to stabilization or change in behavior (Amin Saremi et al., 2015). Therefore, it can be concluded that irrational beliefs in driving when driving off road accidents lead to repetition of them and high-risk driving behaviors, ignoring the fact that the incident is not known and may occur to anyone.

Although related studies were confirmed in the findings of this study, Karimi Jebeli and Farahani (2015) showed that individuals with high-risk driving behaviors have higher positive emotions than low-risk drivers, while positive emotional states increase the range of attention, while the negative excitement of the extent of attention (Fernández-Abascal, & Díaz, 2013) and low risk drivers are expected to have more positive emotions, more attention, and safer driving. On the other hand, the combination of high positive and negative emotions in one person is an indicator of impulsiveness (Karimi Jebeli and Farahani, 2015). Since individuals with high-risk behaviors are characterized by impulsivity, it seems necessary in future researches to be investigated the relationship between both positive and negative excitement with high-risk driving behaviors.

The results of this study showed that more irrational beliefs and lower emotional self-efficacy are more common in high-risk drivers than ordinary drivers. It is suggested that psychological tests be conducted to identify irrational beliefs in applicants for obtaining and extending a driving license, as well as cash crimes or high risk drivers instead to be involved in compulsory classes to deal with irrational beliefs and emotional self-efficacy. This study was accompanied by a time limit for the researcher. Therefore, only a questionnaire was used to collect data and other methods, including interview and observation, were not used.

REFERENCES:

- Atkinson, Rita et al. (1395). Field of Psychology Hilgard. Translator: Mehrnaz Shahr Aray. Growth publication. 768 p.
- Amin saromi, Nozar; Rahmani, Nader; Gholami, Ruhollah (1394). The study of the relationship between social beliefs and driving traffic behaviors (Case study: drivers in Bojnourd). Quarterly of Northern Khorasan Law Enforcement. Volume 2. Number 7.
- Izi, Elahe Sadat (1394). Sociological analysis of high-risk driving behavior among young people. Quarterly of Northern Khorasan Law Enforcement. Volume 2. Number 5.
- Ashooq, Massoud; Aghamolayi, Teimur; Ganbarnejad; Amin; Tajor; Abdul Hamid (1392). Application of planned behavior theory to predict driving safety behaviors in truck drivers. Journal of Health Education and Promotion. Volume 1. Number 3.
- Pourmohamad Rezaye Tajrishi, Masoumeh; Pahlavan Neshan, Sahar; Najafi Fard, Tahereh (1393). The Relationship between Irrational Beliefs and Marital Adaptation of Couples in Isfahan. Journal of Social Welfare Research. Volume 14. Number 53.
- Hojjat, Seyyed Kaveh, Ismaili, Hajar, Hamidi, Mahin, Akabari, Arash, Norouzi Khalili, Mina (1392). Comparison of personality traits and irrational beliefs in parents of dependent and non-addicted adolescent teens in Bojnourd city. Regional Addiction Conference: Faces and Challenges. Narcotics Counter Narcotics Coordination Council of North Khorasan Province. March 12, 2013 Kowsar University.
- Khodayari Fard, Mohammad; Manzari Tavakoli, Vahid; Farahani, Hojatollah (1391). The validity and reliability of the Persian version of the emotional self-efficacy scale. Journal of Psychology. Volume 16. Number 1. 83-70.
- Seoof Haddadi Sani, Susan; Tabibi, Zahra; Salehi Qadardi, Javad (1393). Investigating the relationship between driving anger, emotional self-regulation and inhibition ability with driving risk behaviors. Fourteenth International Conference on Transport and Traffic Engineering.
- Shakerinia, Iraj; Mohammadpour, Mehri (2010). Relationship between personality traits, mental health and aggression with driving habits in high-risk drivers. Journal of Yazd Shahid Sadoughi University of Medical Sciences. Volume 18. Issue No. 3. Special Issue of the Conference on Harmful Behaviors. 233-225.
- Tahmasebi, Fariba; Zamani Alavijeh, Fereshteh; Rostam Niakan, Sharareh; Asadollahi, Abdul Rahim (1393). Investigating the Factors Affecting the Risk-Driven Behavior of Taxi Drivers in Ahvaz City in 2012. Journal of Ilam University of Medical Sciences. Volume 22. Number 6.
- Arizi Samani, Seyyed Hamidreza; Haqayeq, Seyyed Abbas (2009). Psychometric properties of Manchester Driving Behavior Inventory. Footer Journal. Volume 9. Number 1. 28-21.
- Karimi Jebeli, Zeinab; Farahani, Mohammad Taghi (1394). The relationship between extroversion and emotions with driving risky behavior, Third National Conference on Psychology and Behavioral Sciences, Tehran.
- Goodarzi, Mohammad Ali, Shirazi, Maliheh (2005). Investigating the relationship between stimulation and high risk driving behavior. Journal of Psychology. Volume 9. Number 1.
- Morovaty Sharif Abad, Mohammad Ali, Mo'meni Servestani, Marzieh; Barkhordari Firooz Abadi, Abolfazl, Fallahzadeh, Hossein (2011). Predictors of unsafe driving in Yazd city based on the theory of protection motivation in 2010. Journal of Gonabad University of Medical Sciences & Health Services. Volume 17. Number 4.
- Hashemi, Seyyedeh Hoda (1392). Risk Driving Behaviors, Understanding Risk and Attitude in Beginner and Experienced Drivers, and Assessing the Effectiveness of Education on Risk Perception, Attitude and Risk Behavior Beginners. Master's thesis, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences. Mashhad Ferdowsi University. Supervisor: Zahra Tabibi.
- Ajzen, I. (2015). The theory of planned behaviour is alive and well, and not ready to retire: a commentary on Sniehotta, Presseau, and Araújo-Soares. Health Psychology Review, 9(2), 131-137.
- Blankenship, K. L., Nesbit, S. M., & Murray, R. A. (2013). Driving anger and metacognition: The role of thought confidence on anger and aggressive driving intentions. Aggressive behavior, 39(4), 323-334.
- Carey, R. N., & Sarma, K. M. (2016). Threat appeals in health communication: messages that elicit fear and enhance perceived efficacy positively impact on young male drivers. BMC public health, 16(1), 645.
- Fernández-Abascal, E. G., & Díaz, M. D. M. (2013). Affective induction and creative thinking. Creativity Research Journal, 25(2), 213-221.
- Gabriel, A. S., Cheshin, A., Moran, C. M., & van Kleef, G. A. (2016). Enhancing emotional performance and customer service through human resources practices: A systems perspective. Human Resource Management Review, 26(1), 14-24.
- Jessor, R., Donovan, J. E., & Costa, F. (2017). Problem Behavior Theory and Behavioral Health in Adolescence. In Problem Behavior Theory and Adolescent Health (pp. 449-475). Springer International Publishing.
- Muris, P. (2001). A brief questionnaire for measuring self-efficacy in youths. Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment, 23(3), 145-149.
- Nesbit, S. M., & Conger, J. C. (2012). Predicting aggressive driving behavior from anger and negative cognitions. Transportation research part F: traffic psychology and behaviour, 15(6), 710-718.
- Paciello, M., Ghezzi, V., Tramontano, C., Barbaranelli, C., & Fida, R. (2016). Self-efficacy configurations and wellbeing in the academic context: A person-centred approach. Personality and Individual Differences, 99, 16-21.
- Siavoshi, H., Asadi, M., mahmoodi Kahriz, B., Shiralipour, A., Shahdusti, L., Miri, M., & Shayad, S. (2011). The Relationship between Child Educational Styles and Irrational Thoughts of Students: A Canonical Correlation. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 15, 913-917.
- Suhr, K. A., & Nesbit, S. M. (2013). Dwelling on 'Road Rage': The effects of trait rumination on aggressive driving. Transportation research part F: traffic psychology and behaviour, 21, 207-218.
- Valois, R. F., Umstatt, M. R., Zullig, K. J., & Paxton, R. J. (2008). Physical Activity Behaviors and Emotional Self-Efficacy: Is There a Relationship for Adolescents?. Journal of school health, 78(6), 321-327.